

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 18 2006

Appl. No. 10/064,357
Amdt. dated July 18, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 18, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention:

5

Claim 23 has been amended to overcome this claim rejection. Claim 23 now clearly defines that the base and the first induction coil are part of an induction power device, and that the housing, the second induction coil, and the power module are part of the wireless mouse. In view of these claim amendments, reconsideration of claim 23 is respectfully
10 requested.

2. Rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aoki (US 6,670,561):

15 The differences between claim 14 and the cited prior art will be explained in the next section (103(a) rejection) below.

3. Rejection of claims 1-6, 16-18, and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki (US 6,670,561) in view of Shirai (US 5,550,452):

20

The applicant would like to point out the patentable differences between independent claims 1, 14, and 23. Each of these three independent claims contains the limitations of "an effective cross-sectional area of the second induction coil being smaller than an effective cross-sectional area of the first induction coil".

25

The Examiner relies upon Aoki for teaching this limitation in Figures 1A-1B. However, Aoki does not teach that the coils 141 and 142 have a cross-sectional area smaller than

Appl. No. 10/064,357
Amdt. dated July 18, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 18, 2006

that of any of the coils on the tablet 120. Aoki teaches in col. 1, lines 43-51 and in col. 5, lines 7-16 that the tablet 120 contains "A group of multiple coils CX1, CX2, CX3, . . . CXm, which are stretched along the lateral direction (X direction) as longitudinally expansive loop coils, and another group of multiple coils CY1, CY2, CY3, . . . CYN, which are stretched along the longitudinal direction (Y direction) as laterally expansive loop coils, are configured on the tablet (120)."


That is, the tablet 120 contains a large grid of coils that are used for precisely indicating the position of the indicator 140 on the grid. Although the tablet 120 contains many coils, it does not necessarily follow that the coils on the tablet 120 have a larger cross-sectional area than the coils 141, 142 of the indicator 140. Therefore, Aoki fails to teach this claimed limitation.

In addition, Shirai also does not teach the claimed limitation of "an effective cross-sectional area of the second induction coil being smaller than an effective cross-sectional area of the first induction coil". For these reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that the cited prior art does not teach all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 14, and 23. Claims 2-6, 16-18, and 20-22 are dependent on claims 1, 14, and 23, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-6, 14, 16-18, and 20-23 is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/064,357
Amdt. dated July 18, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 18, 2006

Sincerely yours,



Date: July 18, 2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)